

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the title is amended to more clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed.

**I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claim 6 contains allowable subject matter.

**II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,467,911 (Ueyama). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Ueyama discloses all of the features of claim 1. In particular, the Office Action equates the illumination lamp of the presently claimed invention with the "lamp 321 at position A" of Ueyama.

Contrary to the assertions made in the Office Action, Ueyama fails to disclose all of the features of claim 1. In particular, Ueyama fails to disclose an illumination lamp disposed within the body, for illuminating an inside of the body, as recited in claim 1.

The lamp 321 of Ueyama is a metal-halide lamp, which is the same as the lamp 281 of Ueyama. The lamp 281 of Ueyama is a light source for image projection. See column 31, lines 28-30 of Ueyama. Thus, the lamp 281 and/or the lamp 321 of Ueyama is different from the illumination lamp of claim 1.

Specifically, there is a literal and functional distinction between the lamp 321 of Ueyama and the illumination lamp of claim 1. More specifically, the illumination lamp of the presently claimed invention has a function that is unique in that it illuminates the inside of the body, while the lamp 321 (or the lamp 281) of Ueyama does not have this unique illumination.

Instead, as described at column 44, lines 3-5 of the Ueyama, the lamp 321 is positioned at a focal point of a parabolic reflector 311. The reflector 311 reflects the light from the lamp 321, and the light appears to become parallel light (see column 34, lines 22-25 of Ueyama). Moreover, Ueyama at column 31, lines 42-50 describes that the entire light is from a source section 220 that is polarized by a polarization converter 228 and is directed to a modulation section 230. That is, the light from the lamp 321 is converted to parallel light by the reflector 311, and all of the light is directed to the modulation section 230. Therefore, it is not possible for the inside of the chassis 210 to be illuminated by the light from the lamp 321. Thus, the lamp 321 (or lamp 281) of Ueyama does not illuminate the inside of the chassis 210. That is, Ueyama fails to teach or suggest an illumination lamp disposed within the body, for illuminating an inside of the body, as recited in claim 1.

With respect to the rejection of claim 3, the Office Action cites column 36, lines 29-67 and column 37, lines 1-5 of Ueyama and asserts that Ueyama discloses the subject matter of claim 3. However, here Ueyama merely describes that the driving of a motor 224 is prohibited while a door state sensor 263 detects the opening of a door 211. Furthermore, here Ueyama fails to disclose the function to terminate power supply to the light source lamp. That is, contrary to the assertions made by the Office Action, Ueyama fails to teach or suggest that the control section stops supply of electric power to the light source lamp when the detection signal is outputted by the detector section, as recited in claim 3.

With respect to the rejection of claim 4, the Office Action cites the flowcharts of Figs. 43, 44 and 45 of Ueyama and asserts that Ueyama discloses the subject matter of claim 4. However, the operation based on the flowcharts in Figures 43, 44 and 45 of Ueyama fails to disclose the flashing the lamp 321 (or lamp 281) when the door state sensor 263 detects the opening of the door 211. See column 39, line 6-column 41, line 4 of Ueyama. That is, Ueyama fails to teach or suggest that the control section causes the illumination lamp to flash

when the detection signal is outputted by the detector section in a state where electric power is supplied to the light source lamp, as recited in claim 4.

With respect to the rejection of claim 7, the Office Action cites Fig. 9 as well as the first power source 53 and the second power source 54 of Ueyama and asserts that Ueyama discloses the subject matter of claim 7. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Ueyama discloses multiple power sources with respect to Fig. 9.

However, Ueyama discloses the operation of the first power source 53 and the second power source 54 at column 16, line 49-column 17, line 47. Here, the first power source 53 and the second power source 54 of Ueyama are both power sources that supply electric power to the lamp 55. Accordingly, the function of the first power source 53 and the second power source 54 of Ueyama is clearly different from the main power source and the auxiliary power source of the presently claimed application. The main power source and the auxiliary power source of the presently claimed invention supplies electric power to the light source lamp and the illumination lamp, respectively. This feature is not taught by the first power source 53 and the second power source 54 of Ueyama. In addition, Ueyama fails to teach or suggest that the first power source 53 and/or the second power source 54 is capable of storing electric charge.

Accordingly, Ueyama fails to teach or suggest a rear projection television including a main power supply for supplying electric power to the light source lamp, and an auxiliary power supply for supplying electric power to the illumination lamp, wherein the auxiliary power supply is capable of storing electric charge, as recited in claim 7.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3 4 and 7, as well as the claims 2 and 5 dependent from claim 1, are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Ueyama. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel  
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/hs

Date: August 26, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

|                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE<br/>AUTHORIZATION<br/>Please grant any extension<br/>necessary for entry;<br/>Charge any fee due to our<br/>Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|